DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 920 PS 005 237

AUTHOR McIntire, Roger W.
TITLE Guidelines in Constructing Operant Strategies with Children.
PUB DATE Oct 71
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Third Annual Southern California Conference on Behavior Modification, Los Angeles, California, October, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; *Behavior Change; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Philosophy; Ethics; *Operant Conditioning; Reinforcement; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Skinner (BF)

ABSTRACT

B. F. Skinner's suggestions concerning control of society are discussed with reference to the kinds of control already taken over children and students. An emphasis is placed upon the behavioral goal as a necessary characteristic of educational and child rearing procedures. It is suggested that a prejudice against the young allows us to use punitive rules more freely and show less concern with justifying behavior goals when dealing with the young than when dealing with adults. Constructive suggestions are proposed and exemplified in classroom and therapy procedures. In these reports, the application of some simple rules are described. The rules are: (1) You learn what you do, (2) You learn what you teach, (3) You learn what is reinforced, (4) Bad behavior can be made more costly without punishment, (5) The first demands must be small enough to guarantee reinforcement. Finally, the ethics of manipulating human behavior are reviewed with respect to the behavioral goal and the new concern for individual freedom. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED057920

PS 00537

Guidelines In Constructing Operant Strategies With Children[1]

Roger W. McIntire
University of Maryland

Skinner's "Beyond Freedom and Dignity" has suggested an application of behavioral technology which would plan systematic control of human behavior. People who object to this proposed infringement on their freedom, do so not out of fear of being controlled by society, for in an unsystematic way we, obviously, have always been controlled, but rather out of fear of giving Skinner or his followers the privilege of selecting which behaviors will be controlled and selecting the ultimate behavioral goals. We give such power to teachers of children, but we shudder at the thought of giving it to the administrators of adult society. For most of our youthful members, we are already beyond freedom and dignity but we'd like to retain a little for ourselves.

We already provide consequences for social behaviors which should be beyond our area of concern. We intrude into childrens' lives not only in the nice Skinnerian way of influence through positive reinforcement but with primitive and rought coercive consequences as well. The troublesome questions concerning this intrusion are:

1) What is the oldest age group that should be subjected to such controlling authority?

---

[1]Paper presented at the Third Annual Southern California Conference on Behavior Modification, October, 1971, Los Angeles.

2) Is the freedom and dignity withheld from children and which we protect for ourselves really the same as the freedom and dignity Skinner would have us give up?

Emancipation

With respect to the first question the traditional freedom and dignity is continually installed at younger and younger ages. Punitive rules and coercive social controls are being set aside for younger groups each decade. Emancipation of the young may be a painful struggle at times as when even the remaining controls are challenged in campus unrest but it is a trend and will probably continue. However this is not necessarily contradictory to what Skinner would install, but may be a necessary groundwork before control through positive reinforcement can become the central rule. Freedom from arbitrarily punitive rules and freedom from a social control which plans no respectable result are both dignified goals that even the humanist would want and Skinner wants also. Freedom from behavioral rules and from dignity of complete individuality is a myth and is obstructive to social progress.

Who's freedom and dignity?

If Skinner's modification in social control struggled to become a functioning characteristic of our society, who would determine the behavioral goals and which principles will be deemed "inhuman or unethical". Freedom from most punitive controls is a reasonable request, dignity in that some aspects of our activity remain individually determined is also reasonable but which goals and which principles will be accepted in the positive reinforcement approach?

These questions represent the area of guidelines I would like to study with you this morning. First, guidelines in using behavioral principles and second, ethical guidelines in selecting behavioral goals. Viewing again the controlling power given teachers and parents of young children, I think we will agree that the notion of a gradual change in the amount of control and number of behavioral goal changes across age-groups. This gradual letting up of the control has been a common characteristic of past guidelines.

The "Student approach" vs. the "Behavioral approach".

Gradual change in control across ages is exemplified in some of the contemporary contradictions in education. For example, one innovation in contemporary education is to emphasize relevant experience to the student and less directive methods from his teacher. However at the same time, there seems to be the contradictory, and yet also popular, notion that behavioral goals should be identified and stated for each program that is initiated so that the programed incentives can be provided.

So to leave the student on his own and at least allow student representation and control of curriculum decisions is in some ways contradictory to the notion of a more specified program and goal-oriented behavioral approach to education. The "student approach" assumes that the goals of education may vary from individual to individual and, within the broad limits of the areas of education, the student's decisions should be respected. The behavioral approach takes quite an opposite point of view, in that it arbitrarily decides in a very precise manner, what the educational goals are, and then contrives a curriculum to

reach those goals. It may be that the goals are reached less painfully, that is, with less punitive rules and more positive reinforcement. But this in no way subtracts from the fact that the program is totally in the hands of the administrator rather than the student.

As educational revolution continues today, it is a contradiction in terms of control and in terms of definitions of behavioral goals, and therein lies the confusion and the turmoil. In part the behaviorist's solution has been to apply a behavioral approach at the young ages, and leave the freedom approach to the older ages. This seems to imply the notion of a gradual change from a great deal of behavioral control to an individualized and student-determined process of growing up. Historically this isn't a new idea and implies an intelligently selected set of behavioral goals across ages, but there has always been a wide gap between what is formally proposed and what is practiced and becomes the rule. Such educational terminology as broadening of experience, development of intellect, and development of informed citizens, are all familiar phrases designed to imply progress from control towards freedom. But in actuality, the school system has been given many other goals to work towards which have nothing whatsoever to do with progress toward "freedom". These include the keeper of parental morality, babysitter of the family, organizers of PTA, and depository for young potential workers in order to keep the job market clear. Futhermore, rather than proceeding from a precise behavioral control at the older ages, there has been a stagnation instead. As Paul Goodman puts it, "Teachers are instilling an ideology to support their own system of control and

exploitation including the domination of the old over the young."

A Self-Analysis Concerning Prejudice

The problem here has been, that the parents and teachers have the goal of shaping the behaviors that are convenient for them, sometimes without regard for the actual needs of the children. For example, schools ordinarily allow "no talking in line or in class" even though social behavior and verbal practice are the most important skills to learn. In order to construct guideliness which might reestablish some progress towards a system of child-rearing and education which would allow precise behavioral control with a built-in fading procedure to insure later individuality and freedom, a self-analysis would be necessary about when to use behavioral principles and when to allow "freedom".

At times a nation's establishment has found a self-analysis of freedom so painful as to elect suicide by revolution instead. College students have tried to help with this self-analysis, they have failed, and now wish to help with the suicide. But before we behaviorists comply and help with the destruction, we'd better do some analysis of our own to make sure we, at least, have guidelines for constructing the replacements.

There is a prejudice against the children in our land, and possibly a stronger prejudice than any prejudice against any other minority and, certainly more destructive, if only in terms of numbers of victims. The reasons the prejudice persists is that the controlling establishment has great confidence in its decisions about what behaviors to shape at the very young ages, but loses track of its behavioral goal and of its confidence in its decisions as it works with older and older age groups.

PS 005237

Certainly at the first grade level everyone seems to know what some of the valid behavioral goals ought to be. For example it would not be difficult to get a concensus in this room as to what one must do as a first grader in order to be ready to be a second grader. But what is the difference between a fifth and a sixth grader in behavioral terms? Some of us would give a partial answer by alluding to standardized tests but the area of social behaviors and in the areas of science, civics and literature it is difficult for us to make an arbitrary decision.

So it is not so much that we advocate precise behavioral principles for the young ages and freedom for the older ages; it is merely that we are confident that the behavioral goals selected for the young ages are indeed valid and correct while at the older ages we are not so confident and therefore give the decisions over to the subjects themselves who are even more ignorant than we. In fact, most of us know in looking at the literature in behavior modification, that the majority of success we have had with our system which so arbitrarily selects the behavioral goals, has been with the young. The question then isn't whether or not to give control of the goals and the curriculum over to the students, but rather how to correctly apply our behavioral strategies so as to be in line with the goals and needs of the students.

You see, Skinner is right. It is not freedom that is at question. As long as one person has effective consequences to give another, freedom will be limited. The issue concerns the selection of appropriate and acceptable operant strategies for whatever group you are working with, so that they can progress towards some intelligently selected goal.

So far we have always failed to systematically apply behavioral principles so as to make progress towards this end.

As a result of campus unrest and rock concert riots, many persons have come to describe the education and child-rearing practices in our culture as the source of the difficulties we are in. Usually, they point to the freedom given the young as the major source of difficulty. As the population bomb continues to explode and the number of victims of this confusion over control and freedom have increased, the potential of a full-scale revolution seems even more likely. However, the demand of freedom really implies the giving over of the determining of the behavioral goals to someone who is really more ignorant even than we. So freedom is not the answer, and in actuality freedom never was the problem. The difficulty has always been that behavioral principles applied to child-rearing and education have been for the most part punitive and for the most part, lacking in a true behavioral goal.

New Directions

If our system could provide a freedom from a punitive rule and an escape from a system with no particular goal or purpose or product, then a positive reinforcement system progress toward acquiring of skills that the student thinks are relevant (i.e., dignified), then possibly our problems would being to unravel. However, if we fail now to activate a reasonable system for shaping up behavior and a reasonable set of guidelines for its applications and its goals, if we fail in this respect now, then the tragic revolution that some gloomy people predict may in fact erupt. History will most certainly hold us - the

Behavioral Technologists - responsible for the disaster, and will most certainly single us out for blame because those people of the future will know that we had the knowledge of the effective behavioral principles which could have provided the solution if only they had been intelligently applied. If the revolution comes it will be we who knew how to stop it, we will be to blame, not the Establishment which has told us over and over again that it doesn't understand what changes to make or how to bring them about.

Today I'd like to suggest a first approximation of some of the guidelines in the application of our science and guidelines in behavioral principles. I'll start with the classroom setting. Then I'd like to leave some time for questions and comments on that. Then I'd like to present some suggested ethical guidelines and leave time for discussion of that. The conclusion will include some recommendations for change.

Behavioral Guidelines

> In the subsequent section, the general purposes of the classroom model are reviewed from the point of view of teacher and student behaviors and the consequences of each. Four cases of operant strategies are then presented as examples of the effect of these general purposes and the result of changes in these pruposes. The four examples discuss the effects of expanded tutorial arrangements, fading techniques, programed punitive consequences, and environmental engineering for providing correct behavioral opportunities. Conclusions discuss how the rebuilding of the educational environment might begin.

The notion of consequential strategies in classrooms is not a new idea and many incentive systems (grades, scores, privileges, drinks, and recesses) have been reported, and all of us have experienced some of these in our younger days. My purpose here is to suggest the list of

rules we know are at work and how they are bing used in planning these incentive systems. Then I'd like to speculate about the indicated changes.

Rule 1 might be: "You learn what you do." Certainly we behaviorists would place this at the top of the list; and yet, parents still try to "lecture" their children without a plan for action or, more specifically, a plan for reaction; teachers still ask students from grade school to college to read in areas without doing anything in those areas; we still cling to the notion from grade school to conventions that if you tell somebody something, then he knows it. And, behavior modifiers continue seminars and training programs where we insist to teachers and parents that they must allow the practice of behavior and learn to control environmental consequences if they are to change behavior successfully, but our strategy with them is to merely talk.

Rule 2, following from Rule 1 might be that "You learn what you teach", since teaching is a form of behavior. But, of course, it is the teacher who learns. Graduate assistants have known this for years, but it is not a principle that has firm support in the scientific world.

In one research program at the University of Maryland, we have attempted to assess the behavioral effects of being a teacher. In this case, grade school students (first and second graders) had been engaged as tutors in a reading program. This is not a case in which the highest students in these low grades have been selected to do the tutoring of the low performers. But it is rather a case in which average students in the reading class are engaged to teach other average students. So the students are not the highest performers in the class, and the tutored

students are not the lowest. It was the change in reading performance of the tutors that was of interest in the behavioral assessment, as well as the tutees'. The duty assignment of the individual student was changed from time to time in the experimental design so that an assessment of his reading ability was made while he was performing as a tutor and while he was performing as a tutee. The data shows that the student's employment as a tutor was beneficial to his reading ability.

And then, of course, there's Rule 3: "You learn what is reinforced." This is probably one of the most misused rules in the educational process. It is misused because it is given, of course, partially and with a lack of consistency and with a lack of immediacy; but also because it is generalized to include aversive stimulation, and, although the animal laboratory work would indicate that aversive controls work, again the procedures are most often too lax for it to be effective in the classroom.

Other kinds of punishments are mostly punishments by exasperation of the teacher more than they are punishments by virtue of some behavioral criterion of the student. So the student in the punishment circumstance of the classroom learns to watch the teacher's behavior for signs of exasperation more that he learns to watch his own behavior for signs of successes or failures. Privileges, the other side of this coin, are given as reinforcers, but ordinarily only to the good students who have performed large amounts of good behavior. So it is privilege by halo, punishment by exasperation.

Here are two studies to remind us that, 1) Punishment given consistantly, can work and 2) That the strongest reinforcer is not always discovered in the gut.

> The first study described here demonstrates the use of a counter in the classroom to control disruptive behavior. Each counter show the number of points a student has earned in a token economy program; points are given (or correct academic behavior and are spent in a "store". The teacher can substract points from the student's total by closing a switch above the student's counter which then lowers the value on the counter one each second until the switch is opened. Thus arguments about the treatment cost the student points as well as the disruptive behavior itself. Data shows the frequency of disruptive behavior on sessions with and without the counter.
>
> The second study described here was designed to investigate three reinforcers on the vocal behavior of infants: food, tactile stimulation, and adult vocal imitation. Subjects were 24 institutionalized infants ranging in age from three to six months. They were divided into three experimental groups according to type of reinforcement to be used. The dependent variable was frequency of vocalizations per minute.
>
> The results demonstrated that the rate of infant vocalizations was increased with three simple types of contingent reinforcement. Furthermore, adult vocal imitation was consistently the most effective in conditioning infant vocal behavior. Possible explanations for the greater effectiveness of vocal reinforcement, compared to tactile stimulation and food, were hypothesized on the basis of the greater feedback, the greater immediacy of vocal reinforcement, and possible prior institutional deprivation. Examination of the age variable revealed no differences in the effectiveness of the reinforcers; however, both male and female six-month-old subjects in all three reinforcement groups had significantly higher vocal rates during extinction than any of the younger infants.

A final point relevant to the Rule 3, "You learn what is reinforced", is that when this rule is modified to include punishment procedures, it might be better to consider the procedure under the term "response

cost" as Harold Weiner has used that term. We have performed two experiments in which we have attempted to control behaviors with a response cost technique. Each of these cases represents a procedure outside of the classroom, but I think it is relevant to illustrate how a response cost strategy might be used. Here we have moved up to older children, this time working with fourteen- and eighteen-year-olds.

> A procedure based upon simple response cost approach to weaken constant headache complaint was described. S was a 14-yr.-old girl who presented the complaints over a period of 9 mos. Since other consequential means to control this behavior were difficult to employ, the present procedure requested S to write down conditions related to the headache complaints. The effectiveness of the procedure was evaluated by dual assessment method. Data showed that her complaints were eliminated within 8 wks. (Yen & McIntire, 1971)

However, this discussion of the shortcomings of the reinforcer principle in education really misses the major difference between the reinforcer as used in the laboratory and the reinforcer as used in the classroom. In nearly every reported case of successful reinforcement in the literature, there is either a shaping procedure or the behavioral criterion for reinforcement is defined in advance in such a way as to guarantee that some successful performance will occur immediately. Ordinarily, in the classroom, this line is drawn very high, and only those students who can make that very high first jump are adequately supported for their performance.

In two projects performed at the University of Maryland, the shaping procedure has been formally introduced into some classroom activities and low performing children have been transformed into

high performing children. First of all, let me show you another study with first graders in which reading is the problem at hand.

> Formal operant procedures were used to assure successful acquisition of an 80-word reading vocabulary for first and second graders predicted as probable reading failures. The variables investigated were concrete reinforcement and fading procedures with steps so small that students would not fail. Students matched words to pictures, then words to words of decreasing size, with the words gradually approximating conventional text appearance. Picture cues were gradually removed. Group and individual performances showed that both the number of errors emitted during the acquisition of words in isolation and errors in book-reading reliably decreased with the addition of either the reinforcement or fading technique, while the greatest decrease was with both. Reversal procedures showed expected increases in errors. The differential effects were found to be relatively enduring over many reading trials, despite some expected practice effects, which occurred in all experimental learning conditions. The learning environment maintaining a newly acquired reading behavior was also shown to be an important factor. (Hauserman & McIntire, 1969)

Another study, working with older children of fifth and sixth grade, attempted to provide a shaping procedure for very low performances of <u>all</u> classroom work.

> Each day, percentage scores on classroom and homework papers determined assignment of 5th and 6th grade students into three groups. Children who were above 90% or had 10% improvement were given access to all activities in a Project Room. Children with less than 10% improvement were given limited access to the activities. Children who decreased more than 10% were restricted to teaching machines. When spelling scores were no longer included in percentage scores, decreased. When spelling was again counted but math was not, spelling scores increased and math scores decreased. Individual performances were presented for these reversals. (McIntire, Davis, & Pumroy, 1970)

How to Suggest Applications

The tendency, I suppose, of the behavior modifier is to explain to the teacher how the rules, such as the ones above, can be applied in the classroom with efficiency. The general outcome of this is that the teacher pays more attention to rules, possibly a more efficient attention, but also she tends to add new rules and new contingencies to the children's behavior.

This is a dangerous game for the behavior modifier to play, because in education, the most abused rule of all is "Don't use too many rules." The institution is supposed to be working toward graduating these people, toward not using rules at all!

It is because so many rules, particularly punitive rules, have been added to the classroom environment that the problem is so discouraging today. As Charles E. Silberman reports for the Carnegie Foundation (The New York Times Magazine, April 4, 1971), most public schools are "grim, intellectually sterile, ...and show a preoccupation with order and control, a slavish adherence to the time table and lesson plan, the obsession with routine qua routine, the absence of noise and movement, the joylessness and repression, the universality of formal lecture or teacher dominated 'discussion' in which the teacher instructs an entire class as a unit, the emphasis on the veral and de-emphasis on the concrete, the inability of students to work on their own, and the dichotomy between work and play".

I'm afraid at times, in speaking to PTA's, I have given the impression to teachers and parents that they ought to use more "good

rules" with lots of consequences, and now I'm terribly sorry that they went away with that impression. I would rather that they had engaged in strategies which would examine the rules that are now in effect in an effort to reduce the number of inefficient and punitive rules which are suppressing behavior. I'm afraid that we behavior modifiers often take the approach that the reason the good behaviors are not occurring is that there is a lack of positive incentives, when in fact, a great deal of the time in the classroom, good behaviors are not occurring because of a suppression upon them due to punitive procedures and lack of operant shaping. I'm afraid our problem is more analogous to taking off the punitive lid on the behavioral potential of the student than it is a problem of finding a way of tempting him to respond.

It is obvious, I think, from this discussion and many others you have heard, that the behavior of the students is controlled largely by the teacher, and it is the teacher's behavior that we wish to change. But, unfortunately, most of us have focused our attention on response measures built around the student, and our operant strategies are directed toward changing the student's behavior, bypassing the teacher or, at most, hoping he or she will come around with just a good talking-to. I'm soory to say that you can find examples of this misdirection of effort even in the experiments that I have reported to you today.

So the change in behavior most necessary in education *is* the teacher's behavior. The direction of that change *should encourage* the use of less punitive rules built on the models described here. But also it is necessary to emphasize less quantity of rules overall.

With that progress underway, more student behavior would be practiced and opportunities for reinforcement would increase. So here's where the balance of freedom and control can be set up: in the elimination of unnecessary rules - rules with no or, at least, unimportant behavioral goals. If that is to be the balance, then the crucial ethical question is just as the critics of Skinner have phrased it: What ethical guidelines will be used to select behavioral goals?

Ethical Considerations

There are many problems that come to mind when the word ethics is brought out. For example some believe that:

1. Ethics is about taboo behavioral categories.
2. Ethics is about "telling on" your client.
3. Ethics is about using aversive stimuli.
4. Ethics is about how much you change.
5. Ethics is about what you say you can do.
6. Ethics is about what you try to do.

The worrisome notion of ethics in any psychotherapy is of concern to both institutions and individuals. It is of particular importance today because we are in that age where we can evaluate, behaviorally, the effects of psychotherapy and know what effects, good or ill, we have produced. Furthermore, we now have procedures which we all know can change behavior and can be used to change behavior without regard for any ethics.

Possibly the best example of this concern about ethics is in the use of operant and classical conditioning techniques because their potential for manipulation of human activity is so obvious. Now that we recognize this potential, it forces us to increase our concern

about the problem of ethics in therapy. This worry first comes up in the selection of behaviors to be treated, and, secondly in the consequences to be used in treatment.

In the selection of behaviors we usually consider the ethics to be the requirement that we exclude certain areas of behavior from treatment. This view of ethics makes it easy for most of us to respond well to administrative and cultural pressures by simply doing nothing in certain areas of behavior such as human affection and sexuality. However, we may find that the solution to this problem cannot be attained by simply choosing to deal with trivial or basic behaviors which remove us from the realm of ethics. If a patient's problem is homosexulaity, we cannot escape our professional and ethical responsibility by setting up a token economy program which makes sure he gets to dinner on time, that his bed is made, and that he has gone to his job assignment. Nor can we feel more ethically comfortable by merely talking to the patient about his homosexuality. Some of us may have to go out and deal with the behavior itself.

The guide line and watch word in the selection of behaviors for treatment is the behavior goal. If there is an explicit statement of what activities and habits the subject is to end up with, then other ethical questions seem more answerable. If the therapy lacks any kind of behavior goal whatever, then I would wonder if the therapy might border more on fraud than on ethics. Lakin (1969) in his disccusion of ethical issues in sensitivity training emphasized the ethical issue concerned with the behavioral goal by saying it is "imperative for the

trainer to be first of all clear about his own intentions and goals".

Within this watch word of behavioral goal lies the most troublesome problem of conformity. The prerogative to be an individual is precious and I'm afraid that this profession is fast becoming its keeper and guardian. In each professional activity you must ask, "Is the behavioral goal an infringement upon this prerogative?" Or even more subtle, "Am I helping an institution impose a behavioral goal which assumes an unreasonable amount of conformity?"

With this guideline of the individual prerogative and the behavioral goal in mind consider these recent events concerned with our profession:

1. A principal of a Junior High School has suggested that all boys with "hair to long" or "girls with skirts to short" see the school (behavioral) counselor.

2. Ayllon and Azarin's book "The Token Economy" reports successful reinforcement of attendance at religious services.

3. Counter conditioning studies claim success in treating a "cleanliness obsession" (Wolpe, 1964), frigidity (Lazarus, 1963) and "sexual deviations" (Stevenson and Wolpe, 1960).

4. The counseling literature deals with <u>the problem</u> of promiscuity.

So the ethical problems of manipulating human behavior reach beyond and much further back than Skinner. Behavioristic approaches only dramatize the problem because behaviorism is by nature, it seems, arrogant. On the other hand, education has been sensitive to these ehtical problems for decades but only from an institutionalized prospective. That is, the prospective from education has been toward

a norm and conformity which is most convenient for the institution itself. Certain clothes are to be unapproved, certain topics are not to be taught, certain conduct rules receive the majority of the teaching effort because it is these topics which are most convenient to teach and it is these conduct rules which contribute to the convenience. The field has fallen short of its potential, I submit, as a result of the affects of institutionalization on behavioral goals.

Over the past year I have attempted to construct several behavior modification programs at a state hospital. In the process of working at the adminstration of such a staff and obtaining the approval that is necessary, I came to realize that to become institutionalized and be a victim of institutionalization is something that could happen to staff as well as patient. Although the term "institutionalized" has not been defined well in the scientific literature, it usually describes apathy, passiveness, and a general lack of enthusiasm and responsiveness to the environment in which the patient finds himself. It also usually implies that the patient has lost motivation to leave that environment.

Seligman, Mier and Geer (1968) in their discussion of learned helplessness describe similar behavior in experimental animals. Their proedure leads to an animal that cannot solve a simple avoidance problem and will refuse to make responses towards that solution, because, in the past, the aversive stimulus connected with the avoidance problem has not been under his control. The presentation of uncontrollable,

unpredictable "free shocks" renders the animal helpless even when presented at a later time with a solvable avoidance problem.

Seligman et al simply that there is not only a relationship between the presentation of an event and responses which can control behavior (reinforcement) and not only can the relationship between the absence of an event and a response come to control behavior (avoidance) but that also the lack of any relationship between events can come to have consistent control of behavior. So the learned helplessness notion may be somewhat similar to the clinical concept of institutionalization because in both cases there is a lack of responding which may come from the subject's inability to influence his environment through his own behavior.

In addition to the lack of prediction and control, a second factor in institutionalization might be the effort or cost of behaviors which would be counter to the routine of the institution. This might be called "the red tape method". As an example of this method, let me describe the therapy of a nineteen-year-old boy who could not sleep nights because he "was always checking things" (See Yen, 1969). He had to see that the back door was locked, that the basement light was out, that his pen was on his desk for tomorrow. These are not troublesome behaviors themselves except that this person found 70 to 80 things to check each night, some of them for the tenth or fifteenth time.

Since we could find no consequential way to control his behavior, we used "a response cost" or "red tape" method. We asked that he note

in writing each time he checked something, what it was he checked, at what time, how he found it, and what might have happened if the item checked had been "wrong". He agreed to do this I suppose because he had an awe for the great mystery of a professional strategy. Under this procedure the list decreased from 70 or 80 things checked to 10 or 12. Even 10 or 12 may seem extreme but it represents progress. Similar, yet less controlled procedures are, of course, used every day to keep patients from making complaints, students from seeing faculty, and government employee from "acting independently".

If behavior can be changed by repeated practice with a situation in which control of reinforcing or punishing events is lost or is too difficult, then we psychologists who work in such circumstances must reassess our behavior with regard to these new contingencies. Indeed the contingencies may not be new or limited to those people who are in formal institutionalized settings. As the sociologist has said so many times, the institution is sometimes a very subtle thing. So through punishment or the lack of relationship between potential reinforcers or punishers and the behavior of an individual, or, through a high cost of behavior, a patient may become institutionalized, a psychologist might become institutionalized, or even a field or system of therapy might become institutionalized.

Institutionalization might come to have great effects upon our professional decisions and therefore become an appropriate topic for a discussion of our professional ethics. We may ignore or become apathetic or not respond to certain ethical problems concerning our

use of various psychotherapies. The psychotherapist continually makes decisions regarding what behaviors will be changed and what will be used to make those changes. In the process of choosing those behaviors to shape, he also takes into account, along with his institutionalized attitudes, certain punishments which will lead to selection of behavior which "will not make waves" in the administration of his institutions. When this is not in the very best interest of the patient, then the "not making waves" is not a smart or political move, it is an unethical move. So in most token economy programs, we reinforce talking instead of reinforcing affectionate and loving social behavior. Instead of reinforcing appropriate sexual behavior, we reinforce self care behaviors even when we have evidence to show that integration of the sexes would be of more benefit to the self care as well as to the appropriate sexual behavior. Or as the most obvious extreme (from this point of view) I observed an alcoholic ward in which there was no effort to deal with the drinking behavior and of course no opportunities for that behavior to be observed or manipulated, yet there were token economy contingencies on eating behavior (tokens for meals, etc.). Which, of course, was irrelevant to the patient's problems.

A psychologist may consider himself a liberal in the sense that he remains uninfluenced by the Department of Defense in his area of psychological research but it may required another intensity of courage not to be influenced by an unreasonable puritan ethic of his campus or in APA, or NIH.

If you feel you have grown out of this problem because you are now on the teaching or administrative end of our profession and not directly involved with psychotherapy, let me point out that those persons who are administratively responsible for the psychoterhapist must at least indirectly approve or, in the case of the teacher, encourage certain approaches to these crucial decisions. So it is not only the behavior modificationists nor is it only psychotherapists in general that must bear the burden for this ethical responsibility; it is the administrators who allow these psychotherapists to continue their function.

Let me now list some questions that I have encountered in attempts to establish behavior modification programs in the schools, hospitals, and other community institutions in the Washington area.

0. Am I being asked to institute an operant program because the regular personnel are not willing to given genuine incentives for behavior.

1. Are the evaluative techniques and data collections procedures a fair test of the present program as well as the innovative programs being proposed?

2. If bribery and coercion is a part of this program doesn't it teach the subject a materialism that is not realistic to the outside or even if it is realistic, perhaps it is none the less undesirable.

3. If you are going to select the behavior of the subject, a small portion of his total activity, won't this result in a limited and somewhat superficial therapy?

4. Do you have the right to select this behavior category and change it without informing the subject?

5. Do you have the right to deprive the subject of the given reinforcer for the benefit of his behavioral change?

6. Are other behaviors correlated with the one being tested changing in unknown directions?

Those who are at work in any area of psychotherapy or community mental health program will recognize that at least some of these questions apply to many therapeutic approaches other than behavior modification. Because of the massive numbers of people that community mental health proposes to contact and because of the potential of the techniques discussed in this paper, these ethical considerations loom larger than ever before in our field. The psychologist has begun to play the central role in the protection of individual prerogative both in therapy, and in general cultural controls.

Therefore we cannot step forward to apply consequencial control of behavior without seriously considering the behavioral goals from several view points. In fact in many cases we have an obligation to remove consequencial control where the behavioral goals does not meet ethical standards. In many classroom and family situations, the most theraputic and helpful process may be to free some behaviors from rules because of the lack of social direction. With these ethical guidelines and behavioral rules in mind let's look at a few problems and recommendations:

(The following statements were then posed for discussion by the group.)

1. Child-rearing and education is too anti-social in that crucial social behaviors are not given opportunity nor systematic reward, nor a progressive shaping plan.

2. Education is too irrelevant at times.

   a. curriculum is directed toward only academics

   b. college is oversold as a goal to everyone

   c. there is an exaggeration of puny steps as "revolutions" in education (e.g., French in 4th grade).

3. The tutorial system may provide a means of using available talents on students in small groups and small ratios, but requires that the system discontinue teaching a prejudice against the products of its own ranks.

   a. tutors are available immediately from each level, each rank, throughout the system; second-grade talent is a usable commodity to affect education.

   b. the tutorial system requires that the teachers become teachers of tutors and that they operationally specify what is to be learned in each situation. Under the circumstance, the teacher takes on a new primary responsibility, the provision of opportunities for free and ungraded discussion and other opportunities for social behaviors.

   c. The biggest threat to the teacher is this regard, may be necessity of giving over responsibility for the selection of materials to be taught to the tutor.

It is here that the feminine aspect of the task, the leadership, the responsibility, and the priviledges of the student in the system will have changed and given over to tutor-students.

d. the tutorial system would also no doubt destroy the "University" oriented aspect of the lower schools. Now the tutor directly in contact with the students has no experience with a university, and to that extent, would be uncontaminated by the propaganda.

4. The school's area of responsibility, especially in the social area, be further defined. Is it possible that the school has accepted more responsibility than it intended. The school may be interested in getting some monkeys off their back such as dress codes, rules about eating, rules about hair style, rules about manner of coming to school, etc.

5. Teacher-child interaction should be analyzed to prevent unintended bias from occurring. A table of random numbers may be used to insure all children have an equal chance of being called on.

6. Teachers should review each other's teaching techniques. Efforts should be made to foster mutual, constructive unthreatening criticism.

7. Positive Communication with the home should be increased. For example, a private phone and private conference room should be available to teachers to encourage this communication. As part of the parental communication system there should be a system that insures

at least as much "good" information as "bad" information be sent home.

8. Various contrived reward systems should be made available to teachers such as a token system for privileges and a "time-out" room should also be available for each if needed.

So you hear all the complaints about our child rearing practices, or educational practices and our general policies of behavioral control in our society. Our system may be too passive, not asking for enough behavior from its citizen, too feminine, not allowing boy-type subjects at the young ages (or adult ages for that matter), too parental, not using discretion in its instrusion into the private lives of its citizen, too prejudiced, too aggressive, too materialistic, too idealistic, too competitive, too strict, too permissive, too moral, etc. There is so much to fix. We seem to have some of the means to begin some fixing but we must be careful as to how we and our science are used.

When St. Peter went to the heavenly gates it is said he was concerned that all the disciples were there and he was concerned about how the world would ever progress without these founding fathers. So he asked the Lord and He said, "Well, there'll be many philosophers searching for the answers".

"But what if they fail you, Lord, then what will you do?" said St. Peter.

"There'll be scientists and they'll eventually turn their efforts to man's social problems."

"But what if they, also, fail you, then what?"

"Then there'll be specialists in the Science, Psychology and all."

"But what if even they fail you then what?"

"Then there'll be psychologist's who will analyize man's behavior and its relationship to his environment. The consequences of his activities, the goals of education and development and,...like that. They'll get together and discuss their progress and direction in places like Los Angeles."

"But if they fail, then what provision will you make?"

"By then the hour will be late, I will have made no provision. I'm counting on them."

Quotes I would have thrown in if I'd thought of it.

"None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free"

- Goethe

All Professions are conspiracies against the laity.

- George Bernard Shaw

Everyone lives by selling something.

- Robert Louis Stevenson

All great truths begin as blasphemies.

- George Bernard Shaw

References

Ayllon, T. and Azrin, N. The Token Economy. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Becker, Wesley C. Teaching children. A child management program for parents. Englemann-Becker Corporation, Station A, Box 2157, Champaign, Illinois, 1969.

Davis, H., & McIntire, R. W. Conditioned suppression under positive, negative and no CS-UC contingency. Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 1969, 12, 633-640.

Farber, Jerry. The student as nigger. Los Angeles Free Press, 1965.

Goodman, Paul. High school is too much. Psychology Today, 1970, October.

Haugan, T., & McIntire, R. W. Comparisons of vocal and tactile stimuli and food as reinforcers of infant vocalizations. Developmental Psychology, (submitted).

Hauserman, N., & McIntire R. W. Training elementary reading skills through reinforcement and fading techniques. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, September, 1969.

Lakin, M. Some Ethical Issues in Sensitivity Training. American Psychologist, 1969, 24, 923-928.

Lazarus, A. A. The treatment of chronic frigidity by systematic desensitization. Journal of Nervous Mental Disorders, 1963, 136, 272-278.

McIntire, R. W. For love of children: Behavioral psychology for parents. A layman's text in operant techniques of child rearing. Del Mar, California: CRM Books, 1970.

McIntire, R. W. Dog training, reinforcement, and behavior in unrestricted environments. American Psychologist, 1968, 23, 830-831.

McIntire, R. W. Spare the rod, use behavior mod. Psychology Today, December, 1970. (Also, paper to be reprinted in Readings in Psychology Today, 1972).

McIntire, R. W. Training parents and teachers in the use of behavioral principles. Paper read at American Psychological Association, New York, 1966.

McIntire, R. W. Ethical consideration in innovative social programs. Paper read at Maryland Psychological Association, April, 1969.

McIntire, R. W., Davis, G., & Pumroy, D. Improved classroom performance by reinforcement outside the classroom. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, September, 1970. (Also, in Proceedings, 78th Annual Convention, APA, 1970.)

Reynolds, G. S. A primer of operant conditioning. Atlanta: Scott, Foresman, 1968.

Seligman, M. E. P., Mier, S. F., & Geer, O. H. Alleviation of learned helplessness in the dog. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 256-262.

Skinner, B. F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. Knopf, 1971.

Stevenson, I., & Wolpe, J. Recovery from sexual deviations through overcoming nonsexual neurotic responses. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1960, 116, 737-742.

Wolpe, J. Behavior therapy in complex neurotic states. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1964, 110, 28-34.

Yen, Sherman. An operant therapy for Sleeping Difficulties, Unpublished Manuscript, Henryton State Hospital, Henryton, Maryland 21080.

Yen, S., & McIntire, R. W. Operant therapy for constant headache complaints: A simple response-cost approach. Psychological Reports, 1969, 17 (3), 164-165.